

EXHIBIT 13 -

Letter from Norman M. Littell to Roy Stoddard (Jan. 22, 1940), US0036585

WAT C 27
215566

January 22, 1940

CEP-DBS

JAN 23 1940
H. G.

Ray W. Stoddard,
Special Assistant to the
Attorney General,
P. O. Box 2229,
Reno, Nevada.

Dear Mr. Stoddard:

Re: United States v. Walker River Irrigation
District, et al., District Court of the
United States for the District of Nevada.

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of
January 11, 1940, in reference to further proceedings in
the above entitled case, and in which you enclosed two copies
each of the following:

Memorandum from E. W. Kronquist, in re Weber
Reservoir.

Letter dated January 8, 1939, from E. W.
Kronquist to E. C. Fortier.

Letter dated January 11, 1940, to E. W.
Kronquist.

The Department agrees with your view that it would
be advisable to file with the State Engineers of Nevada and
California, notice of the construction of Weber Reservoir
and the Government's claim of the priority for the storage
of water as of April 16, 1936. A copy of your letter, to-
gether with copies of the enclosures, are being transmitted
to the Department of the Interior, with the request for an
expression of its views on this matter. It appears likely,
however, that that Department will agree with your recom-
mendation. This doubtless can be done after entry of the
amended decree.



- 2 -

Since it appears that it would not be practicable to prepare a preliminary draft of the stipulation until after you return to Reno, and since the hearing on plaintiff's motion for entry of an amended decree pursuant to the writ of mandate is now set for February 19, 1940, it is not likely that there will be sufficient time for the consideration of the stipulation by this Department and by the Department of the Interior before the date set for the hearing. Since the views of this Department are contained in its letter of December 9, 1939, and the views of the Department of the Interior are contained in its letter of January 2, 1940, if a stipulation can be procured consistent with the views expressed in these letters, there would appear to be no necessity of submitting the proposed stipulation before it is entered into and filed with the court. The Department of the Interior has concurred informally in this suggestion. If time permits the Department, of course, would like to examine a copy of the proposed stipulation prior to the time that it is entered into by the parties.

You will be further advised upon the receipt of a report from the Department of the Interior, upon the recommendation contained in your letter of January 11, 1940.

Respectfully,
For the Attorney General

(Typed) Norman M. Littell
NORMAN M. LITTELL
Assistant Attorney General